DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 448 EA 005 878

AUTHOR	Barraclough, Terry
TITLE	Evaluation of School Administrators. NAESP School Leadership Digest Series, Number Five. ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, Number Seven.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Elementary School Principals, Washington, D.C.; Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.s
PUB DATE	74
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080353-3514
NOTE	31p.; Related documents are EA 005 662 & 663, EA 004 454, and EA 005 877
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1801 North Moore Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209 ($24.00 plus postage. Available only as part of series of 13 reports)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Evaluation; *Administrator Role; Board Administrator Relationship; *Literature Reviews; *Personnel Policy; School Districts

ABSTRACT

Administrators have always been evaluated in one way or another. Decisions on hiring, training, promotion, and firing of administrators have always been necessary; such decisions are based on some sort of evaluation, whether formal or informal, of administrative performance. The concept of accountability has also affected administrator evaluation. As the public, and in many cases the legislature, press schools to become accountable for their product, a formal administrator evaluation process becomes an indispensable part of school operations. This paper reviews literature on evaluation philosophies, problems, procedures, and instruments, in theory and in practice, to help a school district make decisions regarding evaluation. A selective bibliography is included. (Author)

ED 094418

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Evaluation of School Administrators

School leadership digest

Terry Barraclough

EA 005 878

Prepared by
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Educational Management

Published by
National Association of
Elementary School Principals

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 74-80569
NAESP School Leadership Digest Series, Number Five
ERIC/CEM Accession Number: EA 005 878
ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, Number Seven

Printed in the United States of America, 1974
National Association of Elementary School Principals
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the National Association of Elementary School Principals for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the National Association of Elementary School Principals or the National Institute of Education.

CONTENTS

Foreword v

Introduction 1

Evaluation Philosophy: Questions a District Should Ask 3
- What Information Should an Evaluation System Provide? 3
- How Will the Information Be Used? 5
- Which Personnel Will Be Evaluated? 6
- Who Are the Evaluators? 7

Problems in Evaluation: Can the Results Be Trusted? 8
- Process of Evaluation 9
- Evaluation Instruments 10

Evaluation Procedures: Taking the Necessary Steps 11
- The Preevaluation Conference 11
- Evaluation 12
- The Postevaluation Conference 12
- Followup Action 13
- Self-Evaluation 14

The Evaluation Method: Finding the Right Yardstick 15
- The Performance Standards Approach 15
- The Job Targets Approach 18
- One District's Evaluation Plan 21

Conclusion 23

Bibliography 24

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves the educational community by disseminating educational research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several clearinghouses in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Resources in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for $38 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Most of the documents listed in *RIE* can be purchased through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, operated by Computer Microfilm International Corporation.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education*. *CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $44 a year from Macmillan Information, 866 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022. Annual and semiannual cumulations can be ordered separately.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse has another major function—information analysis and synthesis. The Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, state-of-the-knowledge papers, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

FOREWORD

With the *School Leadership Digest* series, the National Association of Elementary School Principals adds another project to its continuing program of publications designed to offer school leaders essential information on a wide range of critical concerns in education.

The *School Leadership Digest* is a series of monthly reports on top priority issues in education. At a time when decisions in education must be made on the basis of increasingly complex information, the *Digest* provides school administrators with concise, readable analyses of the most important trends in schools today, as well as points up the practical implications of major research findings.

By special cooperative arrangement, the series draws on the extensive research facilities and expertise of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. The titles in the series were planned and developed cooperatively by both organizations. Utilizing the resources of the ERIC network, the Clearinghouse is responsible for researching the topics and preparing the copy for publication by NAESP.

The author of this report, Terry Barraclough, is employed by the Clearinghouse as a research analyst and writer.

Paul L. Houts
Director of Publications
NAESP

Stuart C. Smith
Assistant Director and Editor
ERIC/CEM

INTRODUCTION

> It is interesting to note that many administrators and teachers have taken the position that teacher and administrator performance is too involved and complicated to measure and rank, while teachers have ranked students by specific grades through the years with equally complicated and unreliable evidence.
>
> *DeVaughn*

Administrators have always been evaluated in one way or another. Decisions on hiring, training, promotion, and firing of administrators have always been necessary, and such decisions are based on some sort of evaluation, whether formal or informal, of administrative performance.

Formal evaluation of administrators is a direct result of the increasing size and complexity of the educational enterprise. The Battelle Memorial Institute points out that, unlike business and industry, school systems have not traditionally had formal procedures for evaluating administrators. When schools were small and simply structured, top administrators did not need a formal procedure because they could assess the strengths and weaknesses of their subordinates from firsthand knowledge. "The accelerated growth of most school systems within the past three decades, however, has produced organizations of greater size and complexity, and formal procedures for evaluating administrators have become a necessity."

The concept of accountability also has affected administrator evaluation. As the public, and in many cases the legislature, pressed schools to become accountable for their product, a formal administrator evaluation process became an indispensable part of school operations.

Administrator evaluation serves two major purposes. First, an evaluation tells the administrator how well he is doing his job. Second, it lets others know how well the administrator is doing his job. The Battelle Memorial Institute explains why both participants in the evaluation procedure benefit: "It not

only enables the top administrator to get a better understanding of how effectively an administrative subordinate is performing but it also facilitates the subordinate's work by providing him with information concerning his supervisor's expectations, the important responsibilities of his job, and the alternatives open to him in performing his job."

In addition, evaluation provides information useful in the promotion, transfer, training, and counseling of administrators. According to the institute, evaluation "indicates how effectively an administrator is functioning in his job and whether or not he should continue in that job." Evaluation results also affect contract renewal.

The need for formal evaluation procedures is being met in a variety of ways, not all of which are reliable or fair to the administrator. One school system may use a checklist form to rate administrators against predetermined standards. Another district may use the information in an administrator's personnel files to determine his competence. Still another may use the job targets approach, working with the administrator to set objectives and determine the administrator's success at meeting those objectives.

Each approach has advantages and disadvantages, and each has its adherents. The school district must decide which approach and then which instrument or procedure best meet district needs. This paper reviews literature on evaluation philosophies, problems, procedures, and instruments, in theory and in practice, to help the district make those decisions.

EVALUATION PHILOSOPHY: QUESTIONS A DISTRICT SHOULD ASK

Initiating an administrator evaluation system demands a great deal of planning to ensure that a reliable and fair system will result. The system must, first of all, conform to district goals and policies. If a school district is committed to humanistic goals, for example, the evaluation system will have to be designed to encourage pursuit of those goals.

In order to tailor the evaluation system to district needs, the planners should ask themselves four key questions: What information should the system provide? How will that information be used? Which personnel will be evaluated? and, Who will evaluate them? The answers to these questions will differ from district to district but will provide each district with its own philosophy of evaluation. Evaluation philosophy is, after all, nothing more than the answers to these four questions.

What Information Should an Evaluation System Provide?

The district should decide why they need an evaluation system. What do they need to know about the administrator? According to Campbell, "the first step is one of clarifying the purposes or functions of administration."

After deciding on the purposes of administration, the district can decide the qualities necessary in an administrator and can set up the evaluation system accordingly. The system should be designed, after all, to let the district know if an administrator is good at administration.

Campbell suggests that the major functions of an administrator are

1. To influence the goals and purposes of the organization and to help clarify those purposes in and out of the organization
2. To encourage and support the development of programs designed to implement the purposes
3. To recruit and organize persons into productive teams to

implement the appropriate programs

4. To procure and allocate the necessary resources to support the programs in the order of priority established
5. To evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency by which all of these functions are being achieved

Therefore, the major emphasis of an evaluation system should be to ascertain whether the administrator is performing his five functions in a manner satisfactory to the district.

McCleary believes that "the purpose of evaluation is to monitor the system and insure quality control." To achieve this end, he recommends that information on the administrator's degree of skill, his ability to perform certain functions, his problem-solving ability, and his degree of "appropriate concern" for educational values be collected to measure his performance. Even criteria this vague can help the district pick a fitting evaluation system.

Pharis argues that "evaluation should be a matching of intent to results, a comparison of what was expected to happen with what did happen." This orientation demands that the district be specific in setting targets for administrative performance. Any evaluation system designed according to this ideal must provide information on the administrator's success at reaching each target.

The Battelle Memorial Institute advocates a similar approach:

> The key to an objective performance-evaluation procedure is the specification of job responsibilities. . . . The subordinate, understanding these, is aware of what is expected of him. The supervisor, in turn, can point his evaluation toward performance in relation to the established job responsibilities. In this way, the evaluation can be both fair and objective.

The evaluation system must, therefore, discover evidence of the administrator's performance of specific job responsibilities.

What the district wants to find out about administrative performance will determine the information necessary for evaluation. The next question to be answered concerns the ultimate use of that information.

How Will the Information Be Used?

The information gathered from an evaluation can, of course, be used in many ways. It can aid the district in making decisions about the administrator. It can also help the administrator know where he stands.

The school district often uses evaluation results to reward, punish, or motivate administrators. Among the various purposes of evaluating administrators, Redfern cites four that predominate:

1. to identify areas needing improvement
2. to measure current performance against prescribed standards
3. to establish evidence to dismiss personnel
4. to enable the individual to formulate appropriate performance objectives

Castetter and Heisler enumerate several uses of evaluation results:

- Place the individual in the system where he can realize his own objectives and contribute effectively to those of the organization
- Motivate personnel toward achieving personal and system goals
- Improve performance
- Uncover abilities
- Ascertain the potential of the individual to perform various types of tasks
- Encourage self-development
- Point up continuing education needs
- Provide a guide for salary determination
- Facilitate mutual understanding between superior and subordinate
- Transfer, demote, promote, or dismiss personnel
- Determine whether the organization should retain the individual as a permanent member
- Test the validity of recruitment and selection procedures

Rosenberg* reminds the district that evaluation also gives the administrator insight into areas of strength and weakness and clues to greater effectiveness. Evaluation clarifies the role expectations held for the administrator "by himself, students, staff, community and central administration." And

*1971.

evaluation can be instrumental in a "career development program" by identifying those administrators who possess the potential to fill specialized roles in the school system.

The major point of any evaluation is and should be, again according to Rosenberg,* "to guide and counsel the principal—not to check up on him." Used in the traditional manner, to reward or punish the administrator, evaluation loses its value as a counseling tool. Used constructively to let the administrator know where he is expected to go, how he can get there, and where he can look for help, evaluation becomes a positive force in the school.

Lamb agrees with Rosenberg when he notes that administrators must be reassured that evaluation can be helpful to them. The administrator under evaluation must feel that the process is meant to assist him in the performance of his duties and is not meant to be a "weapon" against him.

In order for evaluation to be helpful to the administrator, it must emphasize future instead of past performance, according to Pharis. Only by stressing the future can the evaluation process motivate the administrator to improve his performance.

Whether evaluation results are used by the district or by the administrator for reward, for punishment, or for counseling will further limit the choices in setting up an evaluation system. The next step is deciding which personnel to evaluate.

Which Personnel Will Be Evaluated?

All the writers agree that principals, at least, should be evaluated. Rosenberg, in his 1971 article, states that "a good administrator evaluational program will result in a comprehensive, valid and reliable appraisal of the effectiveness of each and every school principal in a school district."

Pharis notes that "principals tend to view evaluation like a mother-in-law—necessary but sometimes difficult to live with." But even the principals themselves agree about the necessity of evaluation.

As DeVaughn writes, "advocates of accountability and

*1973.

courts of law are demanding an evaluation system for all personnel." Many state and local legislative bodies are requiring evaluation of both teaching and administrative personnel.

This demand for evaluation of all personnel is being met by most school districts with any sort of evaluation system. Redfern confirms that, according to an Educational Research Service survey, "evaluation programs apply to all administrative personnel in most instances."

Who Are the Evaluators?

Most writers refer to persons responsible for evaluation as supervisors. It would appear from the research that these personnel are in general responsible for supervision of the administrator, are in fact administrators themselves, and are in no way limited to evaluation in their duties.

Although the literature is vague on this subject, it seems reasonable to expect the personnel responsible for evaluation to be experts in evaluation technique. Thus, the assessment task should be handled by persons who have been trained in the techniques used by the district and whose other duties would not interfere with the job of evaluation.

There are other questions a district could ask, and one of the more common is: Should administrator self-evaluation be a part of the evaluation process? Redfern believes that self-evaluation "is the starting point of a comprehensive assessment of performance effectiveness." DeVaughn contends that self-evaluation can add a dimension to the evaluation process, as "the evaluatee perhaps best knows his strengths and weaknesses."

Howsam and Franco advise the school district to play down formal evaluation. Their approach, while contrary to most of the research, is at least food for thought. They suggest developing an organizational climate conducive to performance, rather than relying on evaluation to motivate administrators. Most publics and legislatures, however, require more objective evidence of administrative success than the job satisfaction of the administrator.

PROBLEMS IN EVALUATION: CAN THE RESULTS BE TRUSTED?

Rosenberg* passes a severe judgment on current administrative appraisal systems, calling them "woefully inadequate and unfair," and based on "unacceptable evidence collected with undesirable methods from undesirable sources." Obviously, no evaluation system is free of problems, nor is there likely to be one. Culbertson points out that, because of the incomplete development of the sciences of education and management, an infallible evaluation system cannot be guaranteed.

Nevertheless, an understanding of some of the more common problems should help a school district plan its evaluation process more realistically so that those problems can at least be minimized.

Campbell identifies three very general evaluation problems. First, forces from inside and outside the school limit what an administrator can do. For instance, Campbell states,

> I do not recall a single major proposal sponsored by the Board of Education or the General Superintendent of the Chicago Schools over a recent four-year period that did not meet with the immediate opposition of 40 to 60 per cent of the citizens. Administrators often work within very narrow tolerances.

These limitations can keep an administrator from living up to an evaluator's expectations.

Second, no commonly accepted definition of the administrator's role exists. Campbell indicates the wide variety of administrator role expectations held by the public, as well as by those in the schools. Some expect the administrator to be primarily an educator, whereas others see him as "an adroit manager of the organization," or as a public relations manager whose chief duty is to gain public support ("both psychological and financial") for the schools. This disagreement makes evaluation difficult.

---

*1971.

Third, conflicts in values complicate the task of evaluation. For example, administrators are caught in the middle of the debate between humanists, who advocate student freedom, and disciplinarians, who favor strict enforcement of rules.

Castetter and Heisler cite more specific problems. Evaluations often focus on the personality of the administrator, rather than on results, and most evaluators are not qualified to appraise personality. Also, evaluation results are not used to encourage individual development, so evaluation loses its value as a counseling tool.

In addition, evaluations and evaluators are influenced by the district and are often biased. What is expected of an administrator is seldom made clear before evaluation, and administrators frequently do not understand the criteria against which their performance will be measured.

Process of Evaluation

Once the process of evaluation has begun, other problems surface. Pharis reports two flaws in all evaluation procedures. The first, the *halo effect*, is the tendency to rate a person highly for various subjective reasons. The second, the *horn effect*, is the tendency to rate a person poorly for subjective reasons.

Evaluators tend to turn in favorable evaluations because of an administrator's past record. Good work in the past can carry over into the present, and a good job yesterday is more impressive than a good job last week or last month. An evaluator also tends to have blind spots. He fails to see defects similar to his own. He may also rate administrators he likes higher than he rates those he dislikes.

The horn effect works in the opposite direction. An evaluator's expectations may be too high. He may also rate poorly the person who disagrees too frequently, or the maverick who simply does not conform. Guilt by association can cause a rating to fall, since a man is often judged by the company he keeps. In addition, a dramatic incident, a recent mistake of large proportions, can soil an otherwise unspotted record.

Several other procedure problems are apparent to Castetter and Heisler. Traditional evaluation procedures keep the

evaluator and administrator from communicating effectively with each other. The evaluator's heavy reliance on feelings instead of facts causes the administrator to react defensively.

Evaluation Instruments

Evaluation instruments are often faulty. Bernstein and Sawyer argue that subjective evaluation instruments—graphs, checklists, and similar devices—are seldom adequate to measure an administrator's performance. Such instruments usually use general and impersonal criteria and sometimes confuse means and ends.

Castetter and Heisler also feel that most instruments tend to fragment the administrator into personality parts. Even when added together, those parts do not give a complete picture of the administrator, let alone of his performance.

Pharis distrusts most evaluation instruments. He complains that "typical rating instruments devote considerable space to manner of dress, oral expression, and other factors that are more indicative of personality than administrative ability." He believes, in addition, that checklist evaluations are one-sided and subjective. Such evaluations do not encourage the administrator to participate in the process of evaluation, and they do not help him improve his performance.

Checklists measure the person rather than the job. They do not document administrator performance. The multiple evaluator checklists used by many districts merely compound the subjectivity.

Another type of evaluation, usually called secondary results evaluation, uses the achievements of those under supervision to evaluate administrator performance. For example, principals are often evaluated according to student scores on standardized tests. Such evaluations often credit the administrator with too much control over his environment.

Files or personnel records are also used occasionally to evaluate the administrator. Pharis contends, however, that files include too much irrelevant matter to be useful in documenting administrative performance.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES: TAKING THE NECESSARY STEPS

While there is considerable disagreement concerning methods and instruments of evaluation, most writers agree that the district should establish a set of procedures in advance. These procedures then provide a framework for the evaluation process.

Specific procedures may differ from one district to the next, depending on the particular evaluation methods and instruments used. There is general agreement, however, on at least four steps in the task of evaluation: the preevaluation conference, evaluation, the postevaluation conference, and followup action. Many of the researchers would add administrator self-evaluation to the list of essential procedures.

The Preevaluation Conference

DeVaughn considers the preevaluation conference essential and says that evaluation "should begin with orientation of evaluatees and evaluators, as well as reviewing officials" to the policy, procedures, and instruments of evaluation. In this way, each person concerned with the evaluation process will know what is expected of him.

Brick and Sanchis cite four purposes of the preevaluation conference in the job targets approach:

1. Identification of the current school needs
2. Mutual development of goals by the principal and his evaluator
3. Translation of goals in measurable objectives
4. Selection of activities through which each objective will be achieved

Poliakoff agrees that the administrator and his evaluator should meet to set goals and time limits and to develop a program of action to meet those goals.

The preevaluation conference is admittedly more important to the job targets approach than to the performance standards

approach. A fair evaluation, however, will always let the administrator in on the district's expectations of him, the instruments used to evaluate him, and the criteria he will be expected to meet. He should know the rules of the game before he is asked to play. These purposes are best served by a conference of the administrator and his evaluators prior to evaluation.

Evaluation

The actual evaluation must assess the overall job done by the administrator, according to Brick and Sanchis. This part is by far the most difficult and uncertain aspect of the evaluation process.

Peebles maintains that evaluation should include "sufficient contact with the individual in his usual working area so that the evaluator feels competent to discuss the evaluatee's performance." DeVaughn calls for ongoing appraisal of administrative performance after the "job tasks" have been agreed upon. He emphasizes that this continuous evaluation should be constructively communicated to the evaluatee, who should be offered assistance in his efforts to improve his performance. His failures, as well as his accomplishments, should be given "forthright recognition."

The particular evaluation method depends on the instrument or approach used. The process of gathering information for a job targets evaluation differs sharply from that of filling out objective forms, for example. Whatever the instrument or approach, the evaluation itself is a crucial stage in any administrator evaluation system.

The Postevaluation Conference

The postevaluation conference is recommended as an appropriate feedback mechanism for the administrator. Such a conference should include the same personnel as the preevaluation conference and should be, to all intents and purposes, an extension of the earlier conference.

It is in the postevaluation conference that the administrator is informed of evaluation results and given the opportunity

to discuss his job performance with the evaluator. Peebles cites three areas of discussion: the goals or objectives agreed on in the preevaluation conference, the administrator's overall performance according to district standards, and the administrator's performance of specific responsibilities.

The postevaluation conference is the recycling stage of evaluation. At this point, the results are in and it is up to the administrator and the evaluator to use the administrator's past performance to predict his future success and, more specifically, to set new goals for him. Followup action must also be determined.

Followup Action

Redfern describes followup action as "certain kinds of subsequent activities to reinforce actions taken during the year." These activities might include, for example, further work on a particular project, additional training, or renewed attention to a pressing problem.

The administrator and evaluator should, during the postevaluation conference, "pinpoint those activities," and "consider next steps." Redfern warns, however, that "if it appears that followup assistance should be given, the evaluator should make commitments realistically. Promises that can't be kept shouldn't be made."

Followup action is not mandatory in the majority of cases. When the need for such action is indicated, however, the administrator and evaluator should consider it with the same care and attention to detail that characterized the preevaluation conference. Carefully planned followup action can be a means of improving administrative performance.

What happens if the evaluation is unfavorable, or if there is contention over the results? The administrator should be given, and is often legally guaranteed, the right to a hearing on the results of an evaluation. This is especially true if his job hangs in the balance.

Poliakoff cites three solutions to the problem of disagreement over evaluation results: both the evaluator's findings and the administrator's self-evaluation can go on file, the

administrator can appeal to a higher authority or to a grievance board, or the administrator can be counseled.

The latter solution is perhaps the most novel. Under the Worcester, Massachusetts, evaluation system, the administrator can be counseled by three supervisors other than his original evaluator. The administrator chooses one consultant, the original evaluator chooses one, and the two consultants already chosen choose the third.

For a period of six weeks, the three consultants monitor the administrator and suggest sources of assistance. If, after the consultation, the evaluation is still negative, the administrator is subject to reevaluation the following year. This procedure gives the administrator ample opportunity to learn what is expected of him and to improve his performance accordingly.

Self-Evaluation

Although not all writers agree on the necessity of self-evaluation, there is considerable agreement on its value in a well-designed evaluation system. Ideally, it would occur at the same time as evaluation by a trained evaluator.

Noting that "self-assessment is a subtle process," Redfern outlines the necessarily subjective nature of self-evaluation. The administrator's assessment of his own accomplishments and failures necessitates measuring behavior by personal goals (as opposed to comparing oneself with others). The process of evaluating oneself is "easier said than done," requiring the ability to accept the results of that assessment, both failures and successes.

Self-evaluation of this sort will supplement the evaluator's opinions and provide a check on the evaluation system. The results of self-evaluation are a valid part of the total picture of administrative performance. Self-evaluation will also give the administrator insight into his own performance and will enable him to participate in the evaluation process. It can, in addition, help the administrator to see evaluation as something that happens *with* him, not *to* him.

THE EVALUATION METHOD: FINDING THE RIGHT YARDSTICK

Evaluation methods fall into two general categories: the performance standards approach and the job targets approach. The performance standards process involves rating the administrator against standards determined in advance by the district. Procedures utilizing objective rating instruments (such as checklists) are included in this category. The major assumption underlying this method of evaluation is that administrator performance can be accurately and fairly measured by predetermined, "objective" criteria that measure general, overall performance (as opposed to the achievement of specific goals).

Unlike the performance standards approach, the job targets approach measures administrative performance by determining district goals, setting specific objectives, and assessing the administrator's success or failure in the achievement of these objectives. It usually allows for the administrator's direct participation in the objective-setting process, and the administrator himself often helps to determine the standards against which he will be measured. This approach draws on management by objectives theory adopted from business.

The Performance Standards Approach

Most evaluation instruments now used in the schools measure an administrator against a set of predetermined performance standards. Over three-fourths of the instruments reported in a 1971 Educational Research Service report are of this type. Checklists, secondary results evaluations, "file" evaluations, and a few other instruments employ the performance standards approach.

Checklists ask an evaluator to compare an administrator's performance to a list of standards by rating the administrator on a scale, selecting a descriptive phrase, or commenting in

writing. In most cases, the school district sets the standards, thereby outlining what it expects of an administrator. The evaluation itself compares expectations to results.

The Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory (WPEI), prepared by Richard Andrews, is typical of checklist instruments. The WPEI lists administrator responsibilities and asks the evaluator to circle the letter A if the administrator *always* fulfills the responsibility, O if he *often* fulfills it, OC if he *occasionally* fulfills it, S if he *seldom* fulfills it, and N if he *never* fulfills it. Some of the listed responsibilities are

2. Gains the esteem of his staff by demonstrating a genuine respect for them
8. Facilitates staff participation in community activities
9. Assists staff in understanding their professional roles and responsibilities
14. Organizes staff so that authority and responsibility are clearly understood
18. Effectively contributes to the resolution of student discipline problems
19. Establishes an efficient communications network within the school
25. Handles the routine functions of administration in an efficient manner
28. Contributes to orderly changes in the staff and the system
40. Relates to staff members in informal as well as formal situations
41. Operates within the framework of the established school system policies
52. Understands the function of the school in relation to the community
58. Understands the community and its impact on education
59. Foresees those actions needed to improve the function of the school
60. Clearly interprets the school district's policies to his staff
63. Provides for efficient use of school equipment and facilities

Beall describes a process designed to provide the administrator with information on how well he is contributing to learning. In this process, the administrator and evaluator meet to establish standards of student progress and to agree on techniques for assessing that progress. The evaluation then consists of comparing actual and projected student progress. This process assumes that the administrator has a vast measure

of control over an equally vast number of variables.

Some school districts use personnel files and special evaluation files to rate administrators. Pharis describes such a process:

> A file is maintained for each person who is to be evaluated. Everything—good and bad—that comes to the attention of the evaluator goes into the folder. It might contain summaries of observations, statements of assistance requested or given, transcripts of courses taken, letters of commendation and complaint, clippings, or anything else the file keeper finds. At the appointed time the file is reviewed and a judgment made.

To perform this type of evaluation, the evaluator must wade through an enormous quantity of largely irrelevant material.

Denny suggests a different performance standards approach: a report card to be filled out by the administrator himself. The card consists of a combination of objective and subjective questions covering six general areas: pupils, program, personnel, professional improvement, public relations, and physical plant. This approach allows the administrator to rate himself, but against standards already determined by the district.

Carvell reports yet a different practice. The Ocean View, California, district uses a battery of instruments to determine administrator competence. The instruments are used in battery to cover all aspects of administrative performance.

Performance standards evaluations of any kind are economical of time, energy, and money. They do, however, have some serious drawbacks.

Since the evaluator is asked his opinion of how an administrator measures up to a set of standards, the evaluation is highly subjective. Many instruments are poorly designed. The administrator is rarely, if ever, consulted in establishing the standards against which he will be measured. In addition, performance standards are inflexible and do not allow for changes in circumstances or specific tasks.

Pharis argues for an evaluation system that measures reality. He expects a well-designed system to consider only the variables under an administrator's control. Such a system should

spell out clearly and in advance the criteria against which the administrator is to be measured.

Evaluations should not be subject to different conclusions by different evaluators, and the administrator should be allowed some voice in determining goals. Only one evaluation approach currently in use satisfies Pharis' criteria and avoids most of the pitfalls of the performance standards approach: the job targets approach.

The Job Targets Approach

In an attempt to ensure fair and reliable evaluations, many school districts are turning to job targets evaluation. This approach involves setting *job targets*—often called *performance objectives*—in advance, then determining the administrator's success at meeting those targets.

The job targets approach is perhaps more time-consuming than the performance standards approach, but it has several advantages. The evaluation is tailored to the administrator and to the specific jobs he performs. And it provides the district with reliable evidence of the administrator's performance.

Determining Job Targets

As Bernstein and Sawyer remark, "the modern principal must be evaluated in terms of how well he organizes the resources at his command, first to define and then to achieve truly important job targets." Actually, determining job targets involves two steps. The first step is deciding on district goals. The second is developing specific job targets.

General district goals, as noted previously in this paper, should be decided even before an evaluation system is implemented. Other, more specific goals may be set during the preevaluation conference. This goal-setting enables the administrator and his evaluator to see the full range of possible job targets.

After goals are set, specific job targets must be agreed on. Bernstein and Sawyer point out that the principal should formulate "a thorough overview" of his staff's ideas about what

should be done in the school, taking their desires into account in the definition of job targets. But because not all staff views can be realistically incorporated into job targets, the administrator and his supervisor should carefully weigh these suggestions to determine which are "acceptable and achievable."

Numerous factors should be considered in setting job targets. Two major criteria are outlined by Bernstein and Sawyer. First, the targets must be "delimited" so that they can be precisely defined by the administrator and his staff. Only through specific definition can the administrator be expected to achieve specific results. Second, "a fixed period of time, or perhaps . . . a series of fixed time-periods" should be established to ensure the successful completion of the job targets. Targets may also be affected by such variables as money, personnel, and community opinion.

Each job target should be written down and should include a target date and a description of the administrator's projected course of action in reaching the target. This information will provide the basis for the subsequent evaluation.

Establishing Criteria

After job targets are agreed on, the administrator and evaluator must set criteria. They must agree on what will be acceptable as evidence that the administrator has accomplished each job target.

The performance criteria must be carefully formulated, since they form the basis of evaluation. Bernstein and Sawyer state that these criteria should define what "minimally acceptable performance" will be, as well as determine the "optimum objectives, i.e., the best results that can reasonably be hoped for."

The setting of targets and the establishment of criteria during the preevaluation conference will give the administrator a clear picture of what he is to accomplish and of how his performance will be gauged. The evaluator will know what to look for in the course of the evaluation.

The Evaluation

Between the time of the preevaluation conference and the target date of each job target, the evaluator must gather evidence of the administrator's performance. If self-evaluation is also a part of the process agreed on, the administrator should also collect evidence of his performance.

One of the advantages of the job targets approach is its adaptability to changing circumstances. During the period of evaluation, the administrator and evaluator may agree on extending target dates, recognizing new criteria, or changing job targets. All such changes should, of course, be written up and appended to the materials from the preevaluation conference.

After the target dates, the evaluator and the administrator should write up their respective evaluations. According to Redfern,

> The evaluator must make a forthright assessment of the extent to which the principal has achieved success in attaining the predetermined performance goals. His judgment must reflect a thorough knowledge of behavioral changes that have taken place, recognition of supervisory assistance provided, and the results that have been achieved.

The same considerations apply to self-evaluation.

Bernstein and Sawyer remind the evaluator that "the only evaluation appropriate for the modern principal is that which rates him in terms of how well—or how poorly—he achieved specific objectives, and what qualities of leadership he revealed while administering his projects." Redfern adds a cautionary note that evaluations "should be supportable by evidence gained by observations and visitations, data collected, conferences held, and assistance provided."

The evaluation is not complete without a postevaluation conference. At this time, the evaluator and the administrator can compare their evaluations, discuss the evidence, and recycle the results.

Recycling the results involves determining followup action, setting new job targets, and agreeing, once more, on criteria. The job targets approach to evaluation does not have a

beginning, middle, and end. It is an ongoing process.

One District's Evaluation Plan

One school district's experience with administrator evaluation may be enlightening to other districts initiating evaluation systems. Eugene School District Number 4J in Eugene, Oregon, has experimented over the past decade with several approaches to administrator evaluation.

The district initiated administrator evaluation to hold administrators accountable for their performance. The information provided by the evaluation is used in considering contract renewal and in monitoring the progress of probationary administrators. Ideally, evaluation also enables the district to improve the process of administration.

Asked which personnel are evaluated, W. I. Williams, Director of Personnel for the Eugene district, replied, "All our administrative staff are to be evaluated yearly by their supervisor."* Williams also stated that one of the major problems inherent in evaluation is that the public schools do not have enough trained evaluation personnel due to a lack of inservice training in evaluation.

The Eugene district originally evaluated school administrators with a teacher evaluation instrument. The instrument outlined district philosophy and goals, provided guidelines for evaluators, and asked the evaluator to write brief summaries of the teacher's or administrator's performance in several areas. The form also provided space for recommendations on advancement, salary, and dismissal.

The flaw in this type of evaluation became apparent. The instrument was the same for each person and situation, but duties, goals, and personalities of administrators differed. In short, the evaluation was a procrustean bed—the administrator had to fit the instrument, or else.

For this reason the district turned to a different evaluation system. The new process begins with writing a job description for each administrator. Then the evaluation employs a

*Inperson interview with author, April 1, 1974.

combination of instruments: a checklist of general administrative performance and a separate form for writing up "performance goals," or job targets.

This combination of approaches enables the district to get a much more detailed picture of administrator performance. As Williams noted, each person responds individually, and "no matter what the goals are, the processes ought to be different." The job targets approach allows the district to monitor each individual's approach to a problem or goal without setting arbitrary standards. The checklist adds a more subjective evaluation by the administrator's supervisor.

The success of the job targets aspect of the evaluation system has prompted the Eugene district to plan a new evaluation system relying more heavily on the job targets approach. Since the final details of the new system have yet to be worked out, little information is available.

Williams indicated, however, that the new approach will involve mutual development of performance goals by the administrator and his supervisor. He reminded other districts that "performance goals should not be restrictive," and that the evaluation process should always be amenable to change.

CONCLUSION

The literature on administrator evaluation is often conflicting. Some writers favor the performance standards approach in one of its many variations; some prefer the job targets approach. The performance standards approach is by far the most common. The research, however, gives a great deal of credence to the job targets approach, which, ideally, tailors the evaluation to the individual and to his specific tasks.

The performance standards approach lends itself to arbitrariness on the part of the district. All decisions concerning the evaluation process have been made before the administrator is called in for a preevaluation conference. He has no part in setting up the evaluation. The administrator is consulted at every stage in job targets evaluation, however. He helps set the specific targets and the criteria against which his performance will be measured.

DeVaughn reminds districts that "there must be an agreement on the policies, procedures, and instruments to be used in the evaluation process." The administrator should know how, why, and when he is to be evaluated. Even students are given that much warning before they are graded.

The main point to be made in any discussion of administrator evaluation is that both the district and the administrator should know what is happening: how the evaluation works, how far the results can be trusted, and how well the evaluation works to improve administrator performance. For, as Rosenberg notes, "only with intelligent evaluation can education become clearly defined, achievement oriented, and provided with a rational basis for policies and decisions and actions which lead to greater and greater improvements."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Many of the items listed in this bibliography are indexed in ERIC's monthly catalogs *Resources in Education (RIE)* and *Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)*. Reports indexed in *RIE* are indicated by an "ED" number; journal articles indexed in *CIJE* are indicated by an "EJ" number.

Copies of most ERIC reports, but not journal articles, can be ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. If a report is available from EDRS, its order number and prices are given. When ordering, please specify the "ED" number. Unless otherwise noted, reports are available in both microfiche (MF) and paper copy (HC).

Postage must be added to the cost of all orders. Rates are as follows. Microfiche: $0.18 for up to 60 fiche and $0.08 for each additional 60. Paper copy: $0.18 for first 60 pages and $0.08 for each additional 60.

Address requests to EDRS, P. O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210.

Andrews, Richard L. *The Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory. Preliminary Manual.* Seattle: Bureau of School Service and Research, University of Washington, 1970. 16 pages. ED 050 458 Document not available from EDRS. (Available from Bureau of School Service and Research, 126 Lewis Annex, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98105. $1.00.)

Barraclough, Terry. *Administrator Evaluation. Educational Management Review Series Number 15.* Eugene: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1973. 10 pages. ED 074 588 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Battelle Memorial Institute. *Increasing the Effectiveness of Education Management. A Research Proposal.* Ohio: Columbus Laboratories, 1968. 61 pages. ED 032 642 MF $0.75 HC $3.15.

Beall, Lewis L. "Case Study No. 7: Evaluating the Principal." *Thrust for Education Leadership*, 2, 2 (November 1972), pp. 36-39. EJ 071 422.

Bernstein, Julius C., and Sawyer, Willard. "Evaluating the Principal." In *The Principalship: Job Specifications and Salary Considerations for the 70's*, by George E. Melton and others, pp. 11-18. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970. (Entire document, 70 pages, available as ED 040 492 MF $0.75 HC not available from EDRS. Available from National

Association of Secondary School Principals, 1904 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091. $2.00.)

Brick, Michael, and Sanchis, Robert. "Evaluating the Principal." *Thrust for Education Leadership*, 2, 1 (October 1972), pp. 32-37. EJ 068 044.

Campbell, Roald F. "The Evaluation of Administrative Performance." Paper presented at American Association of School Administrators annual convention, Atlantic City, February 1971. 12 pages. ED 050 452 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Carvell, James. "Case Study No. 6: Evaluating Administrative Performance." *Thrust for Education Leadership*, 2, 2 (November 1972), pp. 31-35. EJ 071 421.

Castetter, William B., and Heisler, Richard S. *Appraising and Improving the Performance of School Administrative Personnel.* Philadelphia: Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 1971. 82 pages. ED 060 540 MF $0.75 HC not available from EDRS. (Available from Center for Field Studies, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104. $5.00.)

Culbertson, Jack A. "Evaluation of Middle-Administrative Personnel: A Component of the Accountability Process." Paper presented at American Association of School Administrators annual convention, Atlantic City, February 1971. 11 pages. ED 051 543 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Denny, Robert. "A Rating Scale for Elementary Principals." *American School Board Journal*, 149, 6 (December 1964), pp. 11-12.

DeVaughn, J. Everette. "Policies, Procedures and Instruments in Evaluation of Teacher and Administrator Performance." Atlanta: Davis (Robert) Associates, Inc., 1971. Paper also presented at American Association of School Administrators annual convention, Atlantic City, February 1972. 23 pages. ED 061 607 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Educational Research Service. *Evaluating Administrative/Supervisory Performance. Educational Research Service Circular Number 6, 1971.* Washington, D.C.: 1971. 62 pages. ED 058 155 MF $0.75 HC not available from EDRS. (Available from Educational Research Service, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. $3.00.)

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Administration. *Selected Bibliography on Evaluation of Administrators.* Eugene: University of Oregon, 1968. 9 pages. ED 018 853 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Howsam, Robert B., and Franco, John M. "New Emphases in Evaluation of Administrators." *National Elementary Principal*, 44, 5 (April 1965), pp. 36-40.

Ingraham, William W., and Keefe, John E. "Values of Management by Objectives." *School Management*, 16, 6 (June 1972), pp. 28-29. EJ 060 383.

Lamb, Joseph P. "Gleanings from the Private Sector." Paper presented at Institute of Field Studies seminar, Spring Valley, New York, December 1972. New York: Institute of Field Studies, Columbia University. 26 pages. ED 071 194 MF $0.75 HC $1.85.

McCleary, Lloyd E. *Competency Based Educational Administration and Applications to Related Fields.* 1973. 10 pages. ED 077 136 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Melton, George E., and others. *The Principalship: Job Specifications and Salary Considerations for the 70's.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970. 70 pages. ED 040 492 MF $0.75 HC not available from EDRS. (Available from National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1904 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091. $2.00.)

Peebles, James M. "Formal Procedures for Evaluating Principals." Paper presented at National Association of Secondary School Principals annual convention, Dallas, February 1973. 8 pages. ED 075 938 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Pharis, William L. "The Evaluation of School Principals." *National Elementary Principal*, 52, 5 (February 1973), pp. 36-38. EJ 077 763.

Poliakoff, Lorraine L. "Recent Trends in Evaluating School Personnel." *National Elementary Principal*, 52, 5 (February 1973), pp. 39-44. EJ 077 764.

Redfern, George B. "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why, and How?" Paper presented at National Association of Secondary School Principals annual convention, Anaheim, California, March 1972. 10 pages. ED 062 693 MF $0.75 HC $1.50.

Rosenberg, Max. "The Values of School Principal Evaluation." *Education*, 91, 3 (February-March 1971), pp. 212-214. EJ 033 258.

Rosenberg, Max. "How to Evaluate Your Principals without Scaring (or Turning) Them Off." *American School Board Journal*, 160, 6 (June 1973), pp. 35-36. EJ 077 234.